

W.H.

4

LETTERS

OF

S. D. BRADFORD, ESQ.

TO THE

HON. ABBOTT LAWRENCE,

IN REPLY TO THOSE ADDRESSED BY MR. LAWRENCE

TO THE

HON. WILLIAM C. RIVES,

OF VIRGINIA;

(Published in the Boston Post, February 17th, 18th and 19th, 1846.)

ALSO, THE

LETTERS OF MR. LAWRENCE,

ABOVE NAMED, TOGETHER WITH THE

FAMOUS FANEUIL HALL PROCEEDINGS, RESOLUTIONS, &c.

IN

FAVOR OF FREE TRADE,

IN THE YEAR 1820.

"I knew a wise man, that had it for a by word, when he saw men hasten to a conclusion—'stay a little, that we may make an end the sooner.'"—LORD BACON.

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY BEALS & GREENE.

1846.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

[FROM THE RICHMOND WHIG.]

RESOURCES OF VIRGINIA—THE REVENUE SYSTEM.

LETTER OF THE HON. ABBOTT LAWRENCE.

We invite the attention of our readers to the interesting communication of this distinguished citizen in our columns to-day. It is a subject which comes home to the "business and bosoms" of us all—the interests and improvement of our own State. Mr. Lawrence, during his service in Congress, was most advantageously known to the whole Union by the clear sighted sagacity and strong practical sense which always distinguished his views of public measures. He is eminently *national* in his sentiments and feelings, and has ever shown himself a true friend of the South. Suggestions from so liberal and enlightened source, naturally commend themselves to the cordial and respectful attention of Virginians. We shall have great pleasure in laying before our readers the additional communication he gives us reason to expect.

Boston, January 7, 1846.

My Dear Sir,—When you were with us the last summer, I more than half promised to make you a short visit in February, and I have not yet given up entirely the long anticipated pleasure of doing so.

I have not forgotten our conversation on the condition of our country generally, and more particularly the strong desire manifested by you, to improve the condition of the people of your own state. I have always entertained feelings of high regard for the "Ancient Dominion," arising probably from the intimate revolutionary associations between her and our "Old Bay State," as well as from my having looked upon her as the mother of many of the greatest statesmen, and purest patriots, which our country has produced.

I am not surprised that you of Virginia should desire to do something by which the matchless natural resources of your native state should be developed. I have thought that the state of Virginia,

with its temperate climate, variety and excellence of soil, exhaustless water power, and exuberant mineral wealth, contains within herself more that is valuable for the uses of mankind, in these modern days, than any other state in our Union.

I need not say to you, that these gifts of Providence are of little consequence to your people, or to our common country, unless developed and improved, for the purposes for which they were intended. When the constitution of the United States was adopted, Virginia contained double the population of New York, and now, New York contains double the number of people in Virginia. I do not propose to inquire into the causes that have produced such a mighty change in the relative numerical condition of these two states. I do propose, however, to state to you some of the reasons why you should *now* set about doing something, to bring back that prosperity, which many of your people believe is forever lost.

The truth is, and not to be denied, that Nature has been profuse in her gifts, in behalf of your people, and you have done but little for yourselves. The settlement and development of the resources of the western country have brought into existence an active and effectual competition with your people in the great staples of your agricultural products, viz : wheat, Indian corn and tobacco. Maryland and North Carolina, like yourselves, are essentially affected by competition from the same quarter ; from Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa. The great west is now supplying largely the New England, and other states, which are consumers of these agricultural staples, in quantity and value to a greater extent than all the foreign world besides. The internal improvements of the country already finished, have brought Boston, by steam, within the distance of four days travel of Cincinnati, by way of Buffalo ; and a contemplated rail road from Burlington, Vermont, to Ogdensburg, New York, will bring us practically yet nearer to those fertile regions of the west. The expense of transportation is essentially reduced wherever rail roads or canals have been constructed, and even the Mississippi herself bears down upon her bosom the products of the west, at less than half the freight that was charged a few years ago.

Thirty years since, a few small schooners were sufficient to carry on the commerce between this city and New Orleans ; now, within the last year, we have had one hundred and sixty-five arrivals from New Orleans at this port, and many of the vessels are of the largest class ; ships from 500 to 700 tons burden. They have brought us tobacco, Indian corn, flour, cotton, beef, pork, lard, lead, &c., amounting in the aggregate to many millions of dollars. Of the first three of these articles, which now come to us in such quantities from New Orleans, our importations, in former times, were almost exclusively from Virginia, North Carolina and Maryland. Can you expect to compete, successfully, with the western regions of our country, where, without much labor, the soil produces double, and sometimes even more, to the acre than the average crops of the last mentioned states ? This competition will increase, and it appears to me that the remedy for its inauspicious effects upon your welfare, is to create a *market at home* for your surplus agricultural products ; by establishing such manufactures as may be adapted to

the peculiar condition of your labor. There are two classes of labor, intelligent and unintelligent ; the former is that kind of labor which requires a considerable amount of mental culture, with active physical power. This combination is capable of applying science to art, and of producing results that are difficult, and oftentimes complicated. The latter description of labor is of that character which depends principally on physical strength : this quality of labor you have in abundance ; and I hope you are not without a tolerable supply of the higher class. You may, without doubt, commence the manufacture of almost every description of articles, requiring but little skill, and prosecute the work with success. Manufactures of such articles as iron, hemp, wool, cotton, leather, &c., wrought into the coarser and more common articles, would succeed.

You will find, very soon after a regular system of the division of labor shall have been introduced, that a desire for knowledge will be created ; more education, more intellectual cultivation, will be desired by those engaged in the mechanical departments, and with this eagerness for knowledge will follow skill and cleverness in the use of tools, and then will follow the inventive power, for which our people have become so distinguished in the estimation of the world.

You cannot do anything in Virginia, that will so completely promote the introduction of rail roads, as the placing of manufacturing establishments on your beautiful water falls. The water power on the James river at Richmond, is unrivalled ; and it seems a great waste of natural wealth, to permit it to run into the sea, having hardly touched a water wheel. If the prominent men of Virginia, of both political parties, will give up their party warfare, and resolve themselves into a "committee of the whole, on the commonwealth, to improve the state of agriculture," by making two blades of grass grow, where there is now but one ; will establish manufactures ; and carry on a well adjusted system of internal improvements, they will then have done something that will be substantial, abiding, which will stand as memorials of their patriotic devotion to the interest of the people, through all time. Let your common school system go hand in hand with the employment of your people, you may be quite certain that the adoption of these systems at once, will aid each other.

You cannot, I should suppose, expect to develop your resources, without a general system of popular education ; it is the lever to all permanent improvement. It appears to me essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, that the people of this country should be educated, and that all intellectual culture should be founded upon our holy religion : the pure precepts of the gospel, are the only safe source from which we can freely draw our morality. It is essential that we should have an educated population ; inasmuch as every man can exercise the right of suffrage : the elective franchise in the hands of an ignorant and debased population, would very soon place our country in a state of anarchy. We should strive to elevate the laboring and less favored classes. In Europe the great body of the people have nothing to do with the election of their rulers ; even in England, free as she is, compared

with many of the continental states, the mass of the people do not exercise the elective franchise: this is a point of primary importance; and your people may rest assured, that taxes for education, even as a matter of pecuniary gain, would greatly enhance the value of their property. I am therefore clear in my convictions not only of the duty, but the expediency of introducing manufactures extensively into your state, with an expansive system of popular education, and from these movements, will soon be seen the happiest results, in a healthful prosperity, and a striking improvement in the condition of the people.

Just for a moment imagine the whole supernumerary population of Virginia employed at a rate of wages, such as are paid in the northern and eastern states: what think you would be the effect? I have not a doubt that the value of land would increase within five miles around each manufacturing village, equal to the cost of all the machinery in it. The sphere of labor must be enlarged; diversified, if you would bring out the energies of your people. I yet hope to see Virginia take that place, among the old *Thirteen*, that seemed by Providence to be assigned to her: it can only be achieved by energy and perseverance, on the part of those who have the destinies of their fellow citizens in keeping. Let the law makers, and those who administer them, not only speak out, but act, give an impetus to labor; let it be respectable for every man to have a vocation, and to follow it. If not for his own pecuniary profit, let him labor for character, which he is certain to obtain, if his labors benefit others. I intended to make some remarks on the recommendation of the president in his annual message, and the report of the honorable secretary of the treasury, to change our whole revenue system. The plan proposed, if carried out, has an important bearing on the subject of this letter, which is, however, already sufficiently long. Reserving therefore my remarks upon the last mentioned topics, for another communication,

I remain very faithfully,

Your friend and obt. servant,

ABBOTT LAWRENCE.

To the Honorable W. C. RIVES,

Castle Hill, Albemarle County, Virginia.

[FROM THE RICHMOND WHIG.]

ANOTHER LETTER

FROM THE

HON. ABBOTT LAWRENCE.

We cheerfully give up our own space to-day, to a second letter from the Hon. ABBOTT LAWRENCE, and feel sure that our readers will thank us for the substitution. We have taken but a mere glance at this document, but think we may safely say, it is a powerful and impressive paper—throwing much light upon subjects of particular interest to Virginia, and indeed to the whole country :

BOSTON, January 16th, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR :—I stated in my letter of the 7th, that I should write to you again, upon the subject of the entire change proposed by the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury, in our Revenue Laws. It is no other than the adoption of ad valorem for specific duties, and a reduction of the whole to 20 per cent.; this being the maximum at which the secretary supposes the largest revenue can be obtained. I shall not now discuss the rates of duty that will produce the greatest amount of revenue. I will leave the secretary to settle that question ; but shall endeavor to show what the effects will be upon the country, if his recommendation should be adopted by congress. I deem the scheme proposed to congress, in the main, a *currency* question, and one, if carried out, that will reach in its operation the occupation and business of every man in the United States. I believe the most economical member of congress will agree that thirty millions of dollars will be required, annually, to carry on this government, for the next five years, and that this estimate does not include large sums that may be wanted to settle our affairs with Mexico, Texas, &c. &c.; and that this sum is to be raised from foreign importations and the public lands. The goods, subject to duty, imported the last year, amounted, in round numbers, to 90 millions of dollars, and the goods free of duty to about 25 millions. I have not the returns at hand and may not be exactly correct as to amounts; but they are near enough to illustrate my arguments: the former paid an average duty of about 32 per cent., creating a revenue, say of 28 millions. If the revenue derived from an importation of 90 millions, gave 28 millions of dollars, what amount must be imported, to produce the same sum at 20 per cent. ad valorem ?

The answer is 140 millions; add to this, the free goods, about 25 millions, and we have an importation of 165 millions of dollars. Our exports have not exceeded, nor are they likely at present to increase above 120 millions: we then have a deficit of 45 millions

to provide for; and how is this balance to be paid? State stocks are no longer current in Europe. Even the stocks of the United States cannot be negotiated on favorable terms.

We, who are merchants, can answer this question, having often been obliged to make our remittances in coin, when our imports have exceeded our exports.

If we are obliged to import 140 millions of goods subject to duty, to meet the wants of the government, it is quite certain, that the coin must be exported to meet the deficiency. If the importations fall short of 140 millions, we then have an empty treasury. In one case, the country will be made bankrupt to fill the treasury; and in the other, the treasury will be bankrupt, and resort to congress for treasury notes and loans. It may be said that our exports will increase with our imports; this supposition I think fallacious. The policy of Great Britain, and that of all Europe, has been, and is likely to continue, to protect every thing produced either at home, or in their colonies. In Great Britain, the article of cotton is now admitted free, the duty having been repealed the very last year. This was owing to repeated representations of the Manchester spinners to parliament as to the necessity of such a measure in consequence of the competition from foreign countries in the coarse fabrics manufactured from cotton produced in, and shipped from the United States. The argument presented in the house of commons was, that the Americans had taken possession of every market, where they were admitted on the same terms, with their coarse goods. This is a true representation, and I apprehend the repeal of the duty on cotton will not enable the British manufacturer to again obtain possession of those markets, for the heavy descriptions of cotton fabrics.

What other article of importance does the government of Great Britain admit free of duty? I know of none. Cotton is admitted free of duty from necessity. How is it with tobacco? A duty is paid of 1200 per cent. Wheat is prohibited by the "sliding scale," and in case of a total repeal of the corn laws, very little wheat would be shipped from this country, inasmuch as it can be laid down, in ordinary years of harvest, much cheaper from the Baltic. Beef and pork are burdened with a heavy duty. The duty and charges on a barrel of American pork laid down in Liverpool, with the commission for sales, amount to \$5 75; so that the quantity of this article shipped to England must be inconsiderable, unless the prices here should be so low as to be ruinous to the farmer. I cannot find in the catalogue of our strictly agricultural products, a single article that is not burdened with a high duty, in England, or other parts of Europe, if it comes in competition with their own products; nor can I discover that there is a disposition on the part of a single European nation to relax their stringent system of duties on imports from this country. It is possible that Great Britain may abate her corn laws, so far as to admit Indian corn at a nominal duty. If it should be done, I have little faith in our being able to ship it to advantage. I state the fact, then, that exports will not increase in consequence of a reduction or even a total repeal of the present tariff. The duty in Great Britain, on all the products of the United States, received in that kingdom, including cotton, is not less than 48 per cent., and exclusive of cotton 300 per

cent.; and this too, on raw produce generally, where the charge of freight constitutes from one-tenth to one quarter of the cost here, and this is *free trade* !

I hope you of Virginia, will examine this matter, and ask yourselves where the best customers are to be found for your agricultural products. I will just state to you, here, that Massachusetts takes more flour, Indian corn, pork, and many other articles, annually, the productions of the west, as well as of Virginia, than all Europe.

The question then arises, what will be our condition after the proposed plan of low duties goes into operation? In 20 days after the bill becomes a law, it will have reached every country in Europe with which we have trade; the manufactories are all set in motion for the supply of the American market; the merchandise is shipped on account of foreigners, in many cases with double invoices, one set for the custom house, and another for the *sales*, so that, instead of the duty amounting to 20 per cent., it will not probably exceed 15 per cent. This has been the experience of the American importers in New York, who, previous to the passage of the tariff of 1842, had (most of them) abandoned the business, not being able to compete successfully with fraudulent foreigners. I will not say that all foreigners commit frauds on the revenue,—far from it;—but I do say that enormous frauds have been perpetrated by foreigners, on the revenue, under *ad valorem* duties, and will be again—prostrating the business of honest foreign and American importers. In less than twelve months after the new plan shall have been in operation, this whole country will be literally surfeited with foreign merchandise; (if it be not so, the revenue will fall short of the wants of the government:) we shall then owe a debt abroad of millions of dollars, which must be paid in coin. The exchanges go up to a point that makes it profitable to ship specie; money becomes scarce in the Atlantic cities; yet bills on England and France do not fall; the loans made to the south and west are called in; demands for debts due from those sections of country are made; exchange cannot be obtained; produce is purchased and shipped; and when it arrives at the north, it will not command the cost in the west; a paralysis will have struck the business of the country; produce will no longer answer to pay debts due at the North, and the next resort is to coin, which is to be collected and sent down the Mississippi, or over the mountains to Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. Western and southern credits are cut off, as the people of those sections can no longer promptly meet their engagements. The new states, and the outer circle of the republic, are the weak points; and the first giving way of the banks, is heard from those points, where there is the least amount of capital. We see the storm approaching like a thunder shower in a summer's day; we watch its progress, but cannot escape its fall. It at last reaches the great marts of trade and the exchanges, having swept every thing in its course; and the banks of the Atlantic cities, after a violent effort to maintain their credit and honor, are forced to yield to this Utopian experiment on the currency. I have no hesitation in stating that all this will take place within the space of eighteen months from the time this experimental bill goes into operation; and not a specie paying bank doing business, will be found in the United States. Where will be the

revenue which was to produce such a mighty sum under low duties? Where is the treasury and the secretary? and the President and his cabinet? The treasury is empty; the secretary is making his estimates of income for 1849, and preparing to ask congress for a large *batch* of treasury notes; or, perhaps the deficit is so large that a loan may be required. We have now come to a point of depression in the great business of the country, which has attracted the attention and anxiety of all classes of people, *all* having felt its blight, excepting the great capitalists and money holders, who are reaping golden harvests by the purchase of property, which the wants of the unfortunate throw into the market at ruinous rates. It is now seen and felt from the low wages of labor, and the great number of persons unemployed, with the cries of distress from all quarters, that it is the labor and not the capital of the country that suffers by violent revulsions, caused by unwise legislation. Have the people of the south and west forgotten their troubles of 1837 to 1842, to the hour of the passage of that law, which has redeemed the credit of the government, and restored prosperity to the country? I have intimated that there is less capital in the new states, than in many of the old ones; it will not be denied that the moneyed capital of this country is held in the northern and eastern states, and that the south and west are usually largely indebted to them. Now, I should be glad to be informed what benefit is to be derived by a planter in Alabama or Mississippi, or a farmer in Ohio or Illinois, by a change like that I have described; particularly, if by chance he should be in debt? Do the people of the south believe they can raise the price of cotton, or be able to negotiate loans, to prosecute the construction of their contemplated rail road? Do Ohio, Louisiana, Illinois, Michigan, believe they are to create a better market for their produce, or sooner complete the harbors, so much desired on the shores of those "inland seas," and be able to negotiate loans, and obtain subscribers to the stock of their intended rail roads, by the adoption of this new system of political economy? And now what say the *great States* of New York and Pennsylvania to this proposed experiment? Can they afford to try it, and are they ready? If they are, it will be adopted; if they are not, the present law will stand, and the country will repose for awhile in happiness and prosperity. Any one would suppose, that those states that are now just emerging from embarrassment, which at one time seemed almost sufficient to overwhelm them in ruin, would be unwilling to try an experiment, which is certain in my judgment, to place them in a position that will be the means of destroying the fair prospects of thousands who resting in quiet security upon the faith of what they deem a paternal and wise government. The question of an important alteration in our revenue laws, should not be kept in suspense. The treasury will feel its effects before the end of the present year. The expectation of a great reduction of duties prevents the merchants from going on with their usual business. Voyages are delayed, and orders for goods are held back, until this important question shall be settled. I say, therefore, if we are to go through this fiery ordeal, let it come at once,—we cannot probably place ourselves in a better condition than we are now, to meet the troubles that await us.

Mr. Walker proposes to substitute *ad valorem* for specific duties,

in opposition to our own experience, and that of almost every other country. I have never yet found an American merchant, who has not been in favor of specific duties, wherever it can be done with convenience to the importer and the government. I confess it is a bold measure to propose a total and entire change of a revenue system, which was established with the government, and has stood the test of experience through all the trials of political parties and administrations, from Gen. Washington to Mr. Polk. It appears more extraordinary at this time, as the country is in a high state of prosperity. The revenue is enough for all the reasonable wants of the government, and the people appear to be satisfied with their condition. The resources of the country were never developing more rapidly; the increase of our population the present year, will probably equal that of the last, which I estimate at 600,000 souls; our wealth too has been wonderfully augmented by the construction of rail roads; there has been a great increase of our shipping, engaged in the domestic commerce of the country, not only by sea, but upon our rivers, and great lakes; the manufacturing interest has been largely extended; and the soil too, has been made to produce vastly more than at any former period. The whole productive power of the country has been greater in three years, (that is since the passage of the tariff of 1842,) than during any equal space of time in our national history. There have been three periods of universal distress throughout our land, since the peace of 1783, and in each case under low duties. I appeal to those who remember those periods; and to others, I refer to the annals of our country. Those periods were from 1783, (the conclusion of the revolutionary war,) to 1789, 1815 to 1824, 1837 to 1842.

I would respectfully recommend to the secretary of the treasury, who appears to have received new light upon the subject of our national economy, to examine the history of the legislation of congress at the above periods. He will find in his own department of the government, an abundance of evidence of the distress that existed under low duties, and a deranged currency.

There is a prevalent idea abroad, that the capital of the country will suffer exceedingly by a revulsion in its business, and that the tariff of 1842 has operated in favor of the capital, and not the labor of the country. There can be no doubt that capital is generally profitably, and safely employed, and well paid. The profits of capital are low, when wages are low; but capital has usually had the power to take care of itself, and does not require the aid of congress to place it in any other position, than to put the labor in motion. congress should legislate for the labor, and the capital will take care of itself. I will give you an example of the rate of wages under low duties, and under the tariff of 1842. In 1841 and 1842, the depression in all kinds of business became so oppressive, that many of the manufacturing establishments in New England were closed, the operatives dismissed, the mechanical trades were still, and every resource for the laboring man seemed dried up.

In the city of Lowell, where there are more than thirty large cotton mills, from six to sixteen thousand spindles each, it was gravely considered by the proprietors whether the mills should be stopped. It was concluded to reduce the wages; this was done

several times, until the reduction brought down the wages from about \$2 to 1 50 per week, exclusive of board; this operation took place upon between 7 and 8000 females; the mills run on; no sales were made of the goods; the south and west had neither money nor credit; and finally, it was determined to hold out till congress should act upon the tariff. The bill passed, and of course the mills were kept running, which would not have been the case, if the act had been rejected; and now the average wages paid at Lowell,—taking same number of females for the same service—is \$2 per week exclusive of board. Yet Mr. Walker says, labor has fallen. Where are the wages for labor, I ask, lower than they were in 1842? Who is to be benefitted by the adoption of a system that gives up everything, and gives no reasonable promise of anything?

I have succeeded, I trust, in showing that there is no probability of our exports increasing, in consequence of a reduction of the tariff, and that the products of the western states find the best market among the manufacturers at home. In regard to the southern and cotton growing states, they are to be greatly benefitted by the increase of consumption of their staples at home. No appreciable quantity can be shipped to England, if the tariff should be repealed, it being already free of duty. The establishment and successful prosecution of the spinning of cotton in this country, has enabled the planters to obtain, for several years past at least, an additional cent per pound on the whole crop, and perhaps even more. The Americans are the greatest spinners of that article in the world, the British excepted. This competition has kept the price from falling to a ruinous point on several occasions, and it has been acknowledged by many of the most intelligent planters in the south. Our consumption reached, the last year, one hundred and seventy-six millions of pounds, which is equal to the whole crop of the Union in 1825, and equal to the whole consumption of Great Britain in 1826. This is a striking fact, and one that should be remembered by the planters. The history of the production and manufacture of cotton is so extraordinary, that I propose to send to you some statistics on the subject, furnished me by a friend. I hope you will not deem me over sanguine, when I tell you that it is my belief that the consumption of cotton in this country will double in 8 or 9 years, and that it will reach 400 millions of pounds in 1856; and further, that we are not only destined to be the greatest cotton growers, but the most extensive cotton spinners in the world. We have all the elements among ourselves to make us so. The manufacture of cotton is probably in its infancy; but a moderate portion of mankind have yet been clothed with this healthful and cheap article. Nothing can stop the progress of this manufacture, but some suicidal legislation, that will prostrate the currency of the country, and deprive the people of the means of consuming. There can be no legislation that will break down the manufacture of cotton and wool, excepting through the operations of the currency. We may be disturbed by low duties; the finer descriptions of cotton and woollens, printed goods, and worsted fabrics, would be seriously affected by low ad valorem duties, but the coarser fabrics, such as are generally consumed by the great body of the people, will be made here under any and all circumstances. If we have competition from abroad, the labor must, and will come down; this has been often tested, and our experience establishes the fact.

In Virginia and other southern states, and even at the west, many persons have believed that the protective system was made by, and for, New England, and that New England, and particularly Massachusetts, could not thrive without it. Now this is an error: the south and west began the system of high protective duties, for the purpose of creating a market for their produce, (although the principle of discrimination was recognised and established when the first tariff was enacted.) It is not true, that we are more dependent on a protective tariff, than the middle, western, or southern states. Those states that possess the smallest amount of capital, are the most benefitted by a protective tariff. We have in New England, a great productive power: in Massachusetts far greater than any other State, in proportion to population. We have a hardy, industrious, and highly intelligent population, with a perseverance that seldom tires, and we have also acquired a considerable amount of skill, which is increasing every day; besides we have already accomplished a magnificent system of intercommunication between all parts of this section of the country by rail roads; this is the best kind of productive power, having reduced the rate of carriage to a wonderful extent; this being done, we have money enough remaining, to keep all our labor employed, and prosecute our foreign and domestic commerce, without being in debt beyond the limits of our own state. Now I ask, how *we* shall stand, compared with Pennsylvania, Ohio, Alabama, Georgia, or Louisiana, when the day of financial trial shall come. I do not deny we shall suffer, but as it has been in times past, we shall go into, and come out of the troubles far stronger than any other state out of New England. It is not my purpose to present to you, the balance sheet of Massachusetts, but it is due to her character, and her dignity, that she should stand before you in her true position. I have never advocated a protective tariff for my own or the New England States exclusively, nor have those gentlemen with whom I have been associated in this cause, at any time, entertained a narrow or sectional view of the question. We have believed it to be for the interest of the whole country, that its labor should be protected, and so far as I have had to do with the adjustment of those difficult combinations embraced in a tariff bill, I have endeavored to take care that the interests of all the states were protected, whether they were large or small. I say now to you, and it should be said in congress, and to the country, that Massachusetts asks no exclusive legislation. If Pennsylvania, New York and Ohio, the three great states, with Kentucky, Georgia, Missouri, Alabama and Louisiana, wish to try an experiment on iron, coal, hemp, cotton bagging, sugar, &c. &c., I am ready as one citizen of Massachusetts to meet it, and await in patient submission the result, which I doubt not will be found, within eighteen months, in the realization of all I have predicted. I say again, I would not, if I could, have a tariff made for Massachusetts alone. If, however, there should be a new one, let *our* interests, with those of every other in the Union, share that protection to which we are all entitled, and of which *we* claim our *full* share. I can with confidence assure you, that we shall go upward and onward. *We will work.* If 12 hours' labor in the 24 will not sustain us, we can, and will work 14; and at the same time feel that congress cannot take

the sinews from our arms, or rob us of the intelligence acquired from our system of public schools, established by the foresight and wisdom of our fathers.

At the risk of writing a long letter, I cannot forbear alluding to the fact, that the habitual agitation of this question of the tariff has worked, in the main, to the advantage of New England.

We were, previous to the war of 1812, an agricultural and navigating people. The American system was forced upon us, and done for the purpose of creating a home market for the products of the soil of the south and west; we resisted the adoption of a system, which we honestly believed would greatly injure our navigation, and drive us from our accustomed employments, into a business we did not understand. We came into it, however, reluctantly, and soon learned, that with the transfer of our capital we acquired skill and knowledge in the use of it, and that so far from our foreign commerce being diminished, it was increased, and that our domestic tonnage and commerce were very soon more than quadrupled. The illustrations were striking in every department of labor, that those who, fifteen years ago, were the strongest opponents among us, have given up their theories, and acknowledged that the revelations are such as to satisfy the most skeptical. We have gone forward steadily, till many descriptions of manufactures are as well settled in New England as the raising of potatoes. Our experience has given us skill, and of course we have confidence in our own resources that does not exist elsewhere.

When I converse with gentlemen from the south and west respecting the establishment of manufactures—they reply that they should long ago have engaged in it, but the repeal of the tariff, the action of the government, prevented them. Now you cannot blame us, if this constant agitation of the tariff question has tended to give New England, not a monopoly, but advantages which she has not been instrumental in bringing about. I have no doubt we have been gainers on the whole, by these agitations, yet we have at times been great sufferers. I wish those states that have withheld their energies from entering upon these industrial pursuits, to examine this matter,—and if I am right, to *take an observation and a new departure*. We have no jealousy whatever concerning the establishment of manufactories in all parts of the country; on the contrary, I believe those gentlemen from the south and west who have been here, will bear witness to the desire on the part of the people who are engaged in manufactures, to impart all the information in their power. there is room for us all. When the southern and western states shall manufacture their own clothing, we shall have become extensive exporters of the variety of manufactures produced here. We have the ships, and the men to navigate them. We shall pursue an extensive foreign commerce with manufactures, and bring home the produce of other countries, such as coffee, tea, &c., &c., and pay for the produce of the south and west, with foreign luxuries and necessities of life. It has often been said here by us, who advocate protection to American labor, that in wearing British cottons, woollens, &c., &c., we were consuming British wheat, beef, pork, &c. I am happy to find authority of the highest respectability for this opinion, in the person of one of the most eminent merchants, as well

as one of the best and most honorable men in England, Mr. William Brown of Liverpool—lately the free trade candidate for parliament from the county of Lancaster. In a letter to John Rolfe, Esq., a landholder, upon the advantages of free trade, he says: “You next allude to the league wishing to injure you. I presume it will not be denied, that all interests in the kingdom are so linked together, that none of them can suffer without the others being injured. We must sink or swim together! Paradoxical as it may appear, I think Great Britain is the largest *grain exporting* country in the world, although it is impossible to estimate, accurately, what quantity of grain, &c., is consumed in preparing £50,000,000 value of exports, by which you are so greatly benefitted. It is placed in the laboratory of that wonderful intellectual machine, man, which gives him the physical power, aided by steam, of converting it into broadcloth, calico, hardware, &c., &c., and in these shapes your wheats find their way to every country in the world.”

I thank Mr. Brown for the clear statement he has presented, of the importance of a home market, and commend this extract from his letter to the consideration of every farmer in the United States; it is perfectly sound, and applies with particular force to our present condition. To place the people in a condition of permanent and solid prosperity, you must encourage home industry, by obtaining the greatest amount of production; this can only be obtained by diversifying labor, which will bring with it high wages; and unless the labor is well paid, our country cannot prosper. Agriculture, the foundation of all wealth, depends on production, and a market for those products. The encouragement of agriculture, in the establishment of manufactures, which if maintained, will be certain to secure a market.

I ask the farmer to look for a moment to the following statement. American flour in Cuba pays a duty of about \$10 per barrel: in Rio Janeiro \$5 to \$6, and in many other ports the duties vary from 50 to 150 per cent.; in return, we take coffee, most of which we pay for in coin, *free of duty*—and this is free trade. We have, too, treaties of reciprocity with foreign countries; and among others, Great Britain, (not including her colonies,) by which her ships are admitted into our ports on the same terms as our own; they come freighted with her minerals and manufactures, which are sold here, and take in return a variety of articles, the produce of the United States, such as timber, lumber, fish, &c., touch at New Brunswick or some other colony, and go home, *free of duty*. We have, too, triangular voyages made from England to Jamaica, and other British islands, with cargoes, and thence to the southern states, where they load with cotton, tobacco, and other produce for England: this, too, is called free trade. I will not pursue this branch of the subject, but give you a fact. Not long since, the foreign carrying trade was nearly all in our own hands; now the reciprocity system, not including the colonies of foreign nations, gives to foreigners more than one third of all the carrying trade of the United States!! I cannot believe the time is far distant when the government of the United States will protect, as it ought, the foreign navigating interest of this great country. If we would have American seamen to man our navy, the mercantile marine must be protected in the carrying of our own productions. One more fact, and I will close

these long, and I fear you will think desultory remarks. Some years since, a few bales of American coarse cottons were sent from this country to Hindostan, as a commercial experiment; the superiority of the fabric, and the material out of which it was made, gradually brought the goods into notice and use in that country, and the annual exportation from the United States increased from a few bales up to 3 and 4000 per annum. The British manufacturers were much annoyed at this interference, and it is presumed that it was through their influence that the East India Company (the government of that country) have repeatedly augmented the discriminating duty on these goods, (which are called drillings,) for the purpose of protecting their own manufactures against those of the United States; prior to 1836, the duty was five per cent. in favor of British goods; in that year it was increased to $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; a few years after augmented to $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and even this rate of deferential duty proved insufficient to keep out the Americans, who drove a profitable trade, notwithstanding the great difference against them.

And now, within a few months, the East India Company have been compelled again to increase the discriminating duty to 15 per cent., in order to exclude our goods altogether; and this difference will, without doubt, accomplish the object. These facts are deserving of a passing remark, as illustrative of the energies and resources of the United States. As late as the declaration of the last war in 1812, this country imported almost all its coarse cotton fabrics from Hindostan, whence they came literally by ship loads, and were paid for almost altogether in coin. No country seemed to be more abundant in means necessary to supply such goods cheaply, than Hindostan; its soil furnished an abundance of cotton, which, though not of equal quality to that of the United States, was much less in price, and labor was cheaper than in any country in the world. Cotton spinning machinery was available through the medium of British capital, and the manufacturers received a protection of 10 1-2 per cent., against foreign interference. No country seemed more secure from foreign competition in these goods, than Hindostan, and least of all, was there fear of competition from the United States; a country fifteen thousand miles distant, where a day's labor will earn about 25 lbs. of good rice, whilst in Hindostan it obtains less than 10 lbs. of very inferior rice. But the American planter furnished a better raw cotton; the manufacturer, a better and cheaper fabric; the ship owner, a speedy and cheaper conveyance. Their united efforts drove the British manufacturer of these coarse goods from the largest British colonial market, and which the American would now be in possession of, but for the interposition of the East India Company, with another protective duty to sustain their manufactories. I have no fault to find with the course pursued by the British in these regulations. I have introduced these facts, to exhibit to you the transcendant folly of attempting a system of low duties and free trade, where it is all on one side.—I have not yet known the British government to reduce the duties to a point that has reached a single important interest. Their free trade and low duties never apply to any article that seriously competes with their own labor, nor are they likely to adopt such measures. The free trade of the

political economists of Great Britain, is a transcendental philosophy, which is not likely to be adopted by any government on the face of the globe, unless it be the Chinese, and we have already the *earnest* of the effect of low duties on the internal condition of that country. The trade of that empire is fast approaching to barter: the precious metals having been drained, to pay for the foreign products introduced into it.

I am aware that I have written a long letter, but I could not well abridge, consistently, with glancing at many topics in which I take a deep interest. The subject is boundless, and I would cheerfully carry out by illustrations and examples many of the points upon which I have touched, but I forbear for the present. When I have the pleasure to meet you, we can discuss all these questions, embracing not only the present condition, but the future prospects and destiny of our beloved country, for which I entertain the strongest attachment. Our strength and glory is in upholding and maintaining the Union.

I shall send, in a few days, statistics furnished me by a friend, who is intelligent, careful and accurate in these matters, and who holds himself responsible for all that will be stated.

I pray you, my dear sir, to accept the assurances with which I remain, most faithfully, your friend and obedient servant,

ABBOTT LAWRENCE.

To the Hon. WILLIAM C. RIVES,

Castle Hill, Albemarle County, Virginia.

[FROM THE BOSTON POST.]

WEST ROXBURY, 16th February, 1846.

C. G. GREENE, Esq.,

Editor of the Boston Post.

DEAR SIR—I send you this morning three communications, containing some comments on two letters of the Honorable Abbott Lawrence, addressed to Mr. Rives, of Virginia, which were recently published in the Richmond Daily Whig, and also in the Boston Daily Advertiser.

They were first offered to the editors of the first named journal, but not having heard from them in reply in the time specified, I had a personal interview on Saturday last with Nathan Hale, Esq., editor of the Boston Daily Advertiser, and desired him to give them a place in the columns of his paper. This request Mr. Hale thought proper to decline. They are now offered for insertion in the Boston Post.

I remain, dear sir, very respectfully,
your friend and ob't. servant,

S. D. BRADFORD.

MR. BRADFORD'S FIRST LETTER.

WEST ROXBURY, (*near Boston.*)

5th February, 1846.

DEAR SIR—I have read with attention the two letters recently addressed by you to your friend Mr. Rives of Virginia, and being unable to admit many of your premises, or, having admitted them, being compelled to draw from them opposite conclusions, I avail myself of the earliest opportunity in my power to address you upon the various subjects brought under consideration. This is of the greater importance, because, looking at the time you have chosen to reappear before the public; the channel of communication you have selected, as well as the nature of the arguments you have used, no one can doubt that your object is to act upon the congress now assembled at Washington, and to do what you can to prevent any change or reduction in the tariff of 1842. This is all fair, and was to be expected. We all like to have our own way, and when one is doing well, and engaged in a highly prosperous business, it cannot be supposed he would desire a change.

I do not propose to say any thing on the subject of your first letter devoted almost exclusively to the suggestion of a plan for restoring the state of Virginia to her former riches and magnificence, because my opinion of it will be easily deduced from the general remarks I

shall offer upon your second letter. No one can wonder that you should propose for adoption by Virginia, a scheme which you have found to answer so admirably for yourself, and the other manufacturers, with whom you are connected. Whether, however, you have not acted, as some doctors do, who, having confidence in only one medicine, propose it as the panacea for all kinds of diseases, however different in character, may admit of some doubt. Leaving then this point unsettled, I pass directly to the topics discussed in your second letter.

From the intimation given near the close of your first communication, I had made up my mind that your second would be devoted to break down, demolish, and overthrow the report of Mr. Walker, secretary of the treasury; nor could I wonder that you should desire to do so. This public document had attracted universal attention, not only in America, but in Europe also, especially in England, where it had been hailed as the olive branch of peace, and had rendered almost acceptable to that proud nation the high and lofty pretensions of the President's message. It had been mentioned as a most extraordinary state paper by the governor of Massachusetts in his annual message. It had charged upon the protective system, as sustained by the tariff of 1842, the greatest injustice and inequality. It had attempted to show how it enriched the few at the expense of the many; how the highest rates of duty were paid upon the articles consumed principally by the poorer classes; how oppressive it was to our commerce and navigating interest; and unjust also towards the agriculturists and planters, in limiting their markets. Mr. Walker had estimated the sum of extra taxation imposed in this manner upon the country for the particular benefit of the manufacturers, as amounting to fifty-four millions of dollars per annum; being equal to double the amount of the revenue of the whole United States. These are high charges, and ought to be disproved, if they can be. I hope, however, that you will pardon my freedom of speech, and impute it only to my regard for the truth, when I assure you that I have been unable to find in your letter the refutation of any one of the charges above enumerated.

You commence by saying the proposal to change or reduce the tariff of 1842, is a "*question of currency*," and having stated the amount of revenue likely to be wanted for the next three years, (equal to 30 millions a year,) you assume it cannot be raised by the rates of duty likely to be recommended by Mr. Walker, (viz., about 20 per cent. ad valorem) without an importation of 165 millions a year. You then describe the disastrous effects of over importation, the drain of our coin to pay our foreign debts, the probable suspension again of specie payments by our banks, and the general, if not universal prostration of the commerce, occupations, and prosperity of the country. We all remember the fearful convulsions in the trade of the country, which have happened so often ever since the peace of 1815; and had you assumed as a caption to your letter the following: "Remarks on the ruinous consequences of over banking, and of excessive issues of paper money;" or had you taken the still shorter one of "A defence of the sub-treasury system," I should have said you had made a good argument, and that the verdict ought to be given in your favor. But when you attribute all these disastrous

panics and revulsions to a certain ordinance called a tariff and to "low duties," I perceive at once you have fallen into an error, very common in practice, but often very fatal in its consequences, of considering certain occurrences, because they happen to be cotemporary as causes and effects. "There have been three periods," you remark, "of universal distress throughout our land since the peace of 1783; and in each case under low duties. Those periods were from 1783 to 1789—1815 to 1824—and 1837 to 1842."

Respecting the first named period, you, as well as myself, must have reference only "to the annals of our country." No doubt the country was distressed, and this was to be expected at the conclusion of a long and disastrous war, which was carried on by the colonies consisting of thirteen distinct states refusing "to form a union for the benefit of all;" owing a vast debt incurred during the revolutionary struggle, without credit, and almost without hope; but how that distress could have been alleviated by imposing a high tariff of duties upon this poor and miserable nation, deprived of the means of payment, I am unable to comprehend. Your remark, as respects this first period, of course has reference to the tariffs established by the different states themselves, as our present United States government dates only from 1789.

As respects your second period, 1815 to 1824, I must express my surprise how you can call that a period of low duties under the tariff of 1816. If you will refer to the debates of that time, you will find it was considered as imposing very high duties. This was the tariff, into which was introduced for the first time in our country, that legislative puzzle called "*minimums*," which used to perplex us so much in casting the duties on our importations. It may be called a happy invention of the government for taxing an article 75 per cent. on its cost under a pretended duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem. It was found to succeed, that is, to create a revenue; and was at a later period extended to woollen goods as you may remember, in the celebrated tariff of Henry Clay in 1828, which soon after produced such a frightful revulsion in the business of the country, and caused the rebellion in South Carolina.

With regard to the third period you have named, from 1837 to 1842, the duties, although on the leading articles of importation much above a revenue standard, were no doubt considerably lower than those imposed by the tariff of 1828; and let me remind you what was accomplished during the existence of the tariff then in being, which commenced in 1832. General Jackson completed the payment of the public debt, amounting at the conclusion of the war to \$158,000,000; and besides providing for all the annual expenses of the government, amounting to an average of 19 millions per annum, actually paid back to the different States the sum of 37 millions, being the surplus then on hand in the public treasury. Such results as these are unparalleled in the history of our own or of any other country. If from 1837 to 1842 the last half of the ten years, during which the tariff of 1832 existed, there were violent revulsions in the trade of the country, the true cause of them may undoubtedly be found in the previously inflated condition of the currency.

I do not intend to deny nor to extenuate in any way, the

frightful crises which took place from 1837 to 1842, commencing in the spring of the first named year, when our whole paper money system, having been somewhat convulsed and shaken from the date of the famous specie circular of the 11th July, 1836, gave way and sank into chaos; when some of the richest and most extensive manufacturers in Boston are said to have had a meeting to deliberate whether they should stop payment or compel the banks to do so; and which ended in the surrender of the last named, in defiance, as Mr. J. Q. Adams justly said at the time, "of every principle of honor and justice." We all remember those times "which tried men's souls," and their pockets too; but if you attribute them to the tariff you deceive yourself. They were produced by our *system of banking and abuse of paper money*; and although at present the mountain appears to stand so strong that nothing can move it, yet its foundation rests on paper as much as ever; and what happened in 1837 may occur again under similar circumstances at any time. Every reflecting mind must see the subject in this light; and this fact, coupled with another, viz: that property, which rests on the continuance of high protective duties, can never be depended upon, is the reason why some of the Lowell shares in companies, which make a profit of 30 per cent. per annum, have been sold at par or under, and can even now be had at 30 per cent. advance. Call to mind for a moment two facts which illustrate the frightfully inflated state of the currency during the time now under consideration. In 1833 the foreign importations amounted to 108 millions. In 1836 they rose to 190 millions. In 1833 the sales of the public lands were 5 millions. In 1836 they were 25 millions; and had not General Jackson, with an energy which never faltered, and a vigilance which never slept, promptly issued his specie circular, (so much abused and misrepresented in Boston) the whole public domain would have been soon in the hands of reckless speculators. In 1833, when the paper money system had fallen into a state of collapse, the sales of the public lands amounted to less than two millions. No country in modern times has probably suffered so much from paper money as our own, except perhaps China some time ago, before America had any trade with her. If you happen to own or have access to a certain book on China, written by an author named Claproth, you may find there a full account of what that country endured, strikingly similar to what has occurred in our own. The emperor finally abolished the use of paper money altogether, to save the empire from entire destruction.

Convinced, as I think you must be, of the fatal consequences of paper money, and filling, as you have at times, a place in the legislative halls of our country, I have looked with aching eyes to see you attempt some remedy for so great an evil. Year after year I have waited to see you use your powerful influence to have some measures adopted to increase our specie basis, to do away with the circulation of small notes, and to subject our eight or nine hundred banking corporations to some more stringent and necessary regulations, in order to prevent the recurrence of such a frightful revolution, as you predict will happen again, should the present tariff be reduced.

There is no country in the world, which has the means of giving

itself a better currency than our own. There is no empire or kingdom in Europe, where it is so bad. I have seen it recently stated that there is one state [Michigan] in which every bank has failed, that has been established there since its admission into the Union.

Another gentleman in Boston occupies a position somewhat similar to yours, the Hon. Nathan Appleton, of whom I have also at times had some hope, as he has, during I believe almost every crisis we have had since the war, written a very sound and sensible letter upon *the currency*; but I cannot call to mind any effort of his when in public life to carry his views into effect. This gentleman also, during the discussion of most of the tariffs which have passed, has published communications upon the impolicy of having very high duties, and yet he held up his hand in congress in favor of the tariff of 1842, which was carried by a majority of only one vote, which led some one to remark that "Mr. Appleton was the gentleman, who always wrote right, but voted wrong." I do not intend to speak invidiously of a gentleman so much esteemed as Mr. Appleton, for whose opinions the public have so much respect. I only regret that, when in his sound judgment he had decided against a measure as injurious or impolitic, he should under any circumstances have been induced to give it his support. From able communications of Mr. Appleton before the public I conclude he must have considered many of the duties imposed by the tariff of 1842 as too high.

To return to your prediction that under the tariff to be submitted by Mr. Walker it will require an annual importation of 165 millions to raise a revenue of 30 millions, it might be sufficient to reply that as yet the financial scheme of Mr. Walker has not been published, nor definitely decided upon at Washington. It will be in time to show its fallacy, when we are in actual possession of it. Without any great stretch of the imagination, I can conceive of a plan, by which the required revenue may be obtained without increasing the importations a single dollar beyond the amount received last year. The amount, you say, imported in 1845 was 115 millions, of which 90 millions were subject to an average duty of 32 per cent. This, you think, may be reduced to 20 per cent. That would produce a deficiency of 10,800,000 dollars. Now it is well known that the annual consumption of tea in this country is about 16 millions of pounds, and of coffee about 100 millions, which are now free from duty. Lay an average duty on tea of 37 cents per pound, and on coffee a duty of 5 cents, and you have the deficiency made good, and a surplus of \$120,000. This you may consider a bold proceeding, but I would remind you that up to the 20th of May, 1830, there was a duty on coffee of 5 cents per pound, of which, even then, when the price was double what it is at present, I do not remember to have heard any great complaints; whereas now, on account of the low price of the article abroad, the consumer here, after paying a duty of five cents, could be supplied at the cost of 12½ to 15 cents. The duty on tea also, you may remember, was at one time very high, amounting to from 12 to 50 cents per pound.

Be pleased to understand that I do not admit that there would be the deficit you name under any modification of the tariff, which Mr. Walker would be likely to propose. On the contrary I am confi-

dent that on many articles of import the revenue would be increased by reducing the duty, because, as the secretary very justly remarks, "many of the duties imposed by the tariff of 1842 are becoming dead letters, except for the purpose of prohibition, and if not reduced will ultimately compel their advocates to resort to direct taxation to support the government." I am against exorbitant rates of duty altogether, and would therefore avoid, if I could, imposing so high a rate upon coffee and tea. I have merely named these two articles to prove to you that, were it necessary, we could make up the deficit you have so confidently predicted, by imposing on two articles only a rate of duty which, although very heavy on the cost of those commodities, would after all be scarcely felt by the consumers. If they pay already 54 millions per annum for the exclusive benefit of the manufacturers alone, not one dollar of which ever reaches the public treasury, they could well afford to exchange this enormous burthen for the tax I have proposed on tea and coffee, and would make a saving of more than forty millions.

I need not remind you of the inevitable result, which always follows the reduction of duty upon a commodity. Look at the wool trade in England. Prior to 1824 the duty on wool was sixpence sterling per pound, and the imports about ten millions of pounds. In 1825 that free trader Mr. Huskisson reduced it to one penny. The consequence was that the very next year the imports amounted to 42,837,861 pounds. The farmers in England, who had "slumbered so long under the tree of protection," like our farmers in 1828, 1832, and 1842, cried out they should be ruined. Now listen for a moment to the remarks of the talented author of the article upon the woollen trade of Great Britain in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. "The reduction, says he, has produced the most beneficial effects, not merely on manufactures, but also on the *steady price of English wools*, which have been much higher on the average since the reduction than they were before, although we have become importers to the extent of half the whole quantity we consumed when Mr. Vansittart imposed the tax of sixpence per pound in 1819." I hope the agriculturists of America will read and ponder upon this when the manufacturers would attempt to persuade them that they can flourish only "whilst slumbering under the tree of protection."

We (the manufacturers) you say "have no jealousy whatever concerning the establishment of manufactories in all parts of the country," and you have recommended this plan to Virginia. Why then have you such a jealousy of foreign manufactures that you would have them prohibited, or subject to such exorbitant duties? There are some manufacturing establishments at the south already; and I have been informed that they, finding it difficult to compete with the manufacturers of New England, are desirous of being protected against the *Yankees*. This might have been anticipated, for the purpose of protection being to sustain an interest, which cannot support itself, the principle is the same in both cases.

In my next letter I shall offer some remarks upon what you have alleged as to the illiberality of England in refusing to take our products, and upon the great increase in our shipping and general prosperity, which I shall attempt to show we are in possession of, not

in consequence of our high protecting duties, but in spite of them. I may also submit some observations on other topics of your communication, which do not occur to me at the present moment.

I remain very truly,

Your friend and ob't serv't,

S. D. BRADFORD.

To the Hon. ABBOTT LAWRENCE, Boston.

MR. BRADFORD'S SECOND LETTER.

[FROM THE BOSTON POST.]

WEST ROXBURY, (near Boston.)

7th February, 1846.

DEAR SIR—I promised in my last communication to offer some remarks in the present upon what you have alleged respecting the illiberality of England in her commercial dealings with us; upon the great increase in our shipping, and general prosperity; and perhaps also upon some other topics discussed in your letter. In order to decide the first point, no method can be so fair as to compare the amount we import from England, with the amount, which she imports from America. In a word, *we must cypher a little*, in order to settle the matter; as you have done to ascertain how large our importations would have to be, in case the present tariff should be reduced.

I have not before me the official returns of our imports and exports for the last year, but I have those of 1833, which probably will do just as well; as if any material change has since occurred, it will most likely show a relative increase of our exports to Great Britain.

I find then that in 1833, our total of exports amounted

to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$108,486,616
Of this amount England took	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,445,076
Scotland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,695,979
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38,555
The British West Indies, Gibraltar, Malta, British East Indies, British American Colonies, Cape of Good Hope, Australia, Honduras, and British Guiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,663,802

Making a grand total of - - - - - \$58,843,412

It will be seen by this that Great Britain furnished a market for more than one half of our exports to all parts of the world; and on cotton, which constituted in that year 60 per cent. of our total exportations, the duty imposed was only 2s. 11d., or 70 cents per hun-

dred weight, equal to about 8 or 9 per cent. on the cost of the article during that year; not 75 to 100 per cent., which we were exacting at the time on many kinds of her coarse cotton manufactures. Our imports during the same year from Great Britain and her possessions abroad, before enumerated, amounted to \$49,051,180, and the greater part of them were subject to very high rates of duty, varying from 10 to 100 per cent.; as any one may see by turning to the tariff of 1832.

During this year, you perceive the exports exceeded the imports by the sum of \$9,792,232; but on reference to the official value of imports and exports during the year ending 30th June, 1844, I find our exports to Great Britain and her foreign possessions amounted to \$61,721,876, whilst our imports from these countries amounted to only \$45,459,122; showing a balance against Great Britain of \$16,262,754 in a single year! Surely if such a result be a proof of illiberality, I hope we may continue to have many such, not only from Great Britain, but from all the other countries in the world.

I find, also, on turning to the annual circular of Messrs. Colin Campbell and Son, of Liverpool, that the total import of cotton into the United Kingdom in 1845, was 1,856,865 bales, of which 1,500,369 bales were from America; and that this amount exceeded that of 1844, by 252,684 bales; equal to more than half of all the cotton consumed in the United States, according to your own estimate. How can you expect the intelligent planters of South Carolina, and of the other cotton growing states to be content with the narrow contracted market you have offered them, when they have before them such a fact as this; when they see that single *illiberal* nation called Great Britain, has taken in one year very nearly two thirds of all the cotton produced in the country.

I do not find that you are contented with the home market for the sale of your manufactures. On the contrary, it would seem by your account that you have invaded with them South America, India, China, and have even sent a few hundred bales of "cotton drills" to London, in order that you might "beard the lion in his den;" writing to your friend Mr. Greg, late member of parliament for Manchester, at the same time, saying that you were quite satisfied "the Americans would soon become extensive exporters of *twist*, as well as of all manufactured fabrics of yarn under No. 30's." and that "where the principal elements entering into the cost of an article are composed of raw cotton and power, America will compete successfully with any country in the world," whilst at the same time such cotton drills were subject to a duty of 75 to 100 per cent. in this country, not one fraction of which are you willing to relinquish. The letter to Mr. Greg, in which you made the above statement, was published both in England and America.

You have informed Mr. Rives how you or some of your friends have been treated by the East India Company, (at Calcutta, I suppose) "having increased the discriminating duty on some coarse cottons, (Suffolk drills I have understood they are called) for the purpose of protecting their own manufactures against those of the United States." You add, "you have no fault to find with the British in these regulations;" nor could you with any propriety do so, knowing the tariff of 1842, which you are so desirous to perpetuate, affords you a protection, as I have before observed, on a simi-

lar article of British manufacture, of more than four times the amount.

I do not think, however, that you more than half like this fiscal regulation after all, or you would not have devoted so much of your letter to a statement of it. You should remember it is one of the legitimate consequences of the protective system, and from this example you may be able to form some conception how the manufacturers of Europe felt, when they received the news of the passage of the tariff of 1842. I should be reluctant to repeat the execrations I heard some of them utter, especially those who had shipped their property to our shores upon the faith of the American government that a duty only of 20 per cent. should be exacted; whereas that actually demanded, and *paid also*, amounted in many instances to more than 100 per cent. They called it a *legislative fraud*.

I cannot say I think you have spoken with justice or candor of the motives, which actuated the British government in the total repeal of the duty on cotton. The struggle was long and animated, and finally terminated victoriously for the manufacturers, in consequence of the untiring exertions of those *free traders* in Manchester and the vicinity, whose system of political economy you characterise as a "transcendental philosophy," fit only for adoption by the celestials of China, I suppose, whose commerce you represent as having been revolutionized by this novel fallacy called *free trade*. "It is fast approaching," you say, "to barter, the precious metals having been drained to pay for foreign productions." Probably a large proportion of these "products" consisted of Lowell cottons. Indeed we all know this to be the fact; and how can you, of all men in the world, complain of this? In what other way do you expect to find a vent for the manufactures, in which are to be consumed "the four hundred millions of pounds of cotton," which you say will be required in 1856? "But a moderate portion of mankind," say you, "have as yet been clothed with this cheap and healthful article." Free trade, according to your account, is fast producing this desirable result. If the manufacturers or merchants have found their recent shipments less profitable than before, it arises probably from their having sent too many goods. You and I recollect very well when the Chinese would take nothing from us but specie: and the fitting out of half a dozen Chinamen by the late Theodore Lyman and the present T. H. Perkins, and Bryant and Sturgis, produced a revulsion in the money market of the country, similar to that which occurs now in London, when there is a bad harvest, and the bank of England is called upon to furnish gold to pay for foreign corn. What has saved us from this revulsion now, but *free trade*, according to your own account?

The true reason why the British government did not abandon the duty on cotton sooner, was that they deemed it absolutely necessary to enable them to maintain the public faith. It amounted to about three millions of dollars, and being obliged to raise two hundred and fifty millions per annum, to pay the expenses of the government and the interest of the national debt, they could not then see any way to do without it. It was, however, finally relinquished; government at the time remarking to the deputation, which waited upon them, they regretted not having it in their power to repeal some other taxes on commodities connected with the prosperity of British manufactures.

In 1832, as I have already said, was passed the compromise act reducing the rates of duty.

Let us now see how the account stands.

In 1832 the tonnage was	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,439,450
In 1833	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,601,149

and it went on increasing every year until 1837, when it reached 1,896,685 tons.

I remember it was stated in 1828, the year in which you took such an active part in the famous Harrisburg convention to stimulate the government to pass the tariff of that year, that in the great commercial city of New York there could not be found a ship upon the stocks in all the numerous ship yards there ; and that to every part of the Union, where vessels are built, countermands had been sent in cases where any were building. This statement may not have been true to the letter, but the falling off of the tonnage in a single year to the extent of 480,594 tons, (a circumstance almost incredible, if it were not proved by the public documents,) gives to it a sufficient confirmation.

I hope, however, that portion of our nation connected with the building or navigating of vessels will remember what happened in 1829, when they are called upon to give their votes for candidates, who support high protective duties.

Your statements respecting the tonnage are so extraordinary I apprehend the printer of your letter must have fallen into a great error.

Speaking of your commencement in manufacturing you say—
“ We (meaning I suppose the manufacturers of Lowell and other parts of Massachusetts) came into it however reluctantly, and soon learned that with the transfer of our capital we acquired skill and knowledge in the use of it, and that so far from our foreign commerce being diminished it was increased, and that our *domestic tonnage and commerce* were very soon *quadrupled*.”

I do not know the exact period from which you date, but presume you refer to 1828, when you first engaged in domestic manufactures. The American Almanac states the amount of tonnage for that year to have been 1,741,391 tons, and on the 30th of June, 1844, 2,280,095 tons, an increase of only 31 per cent. in 16 years ; whereas according to your statement it ought to have been 7 millions !!!

I infer from your remarks upon our navigating interest that you disapprove of what you call “ the reciprocity system,” which allows foreign vessels to enter our ports upon the same conditions accorded to American ships entering the ports of foreign nations. If these reciprocity treaties are of a comparatively recent date, commencing, I believe, from 1815, the reason may be found in the illiberal and unwise legislation of other countries. From what we know of the enlightened policy of Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and nearly all our great statesmen, it may be inferred they would have approved of the “ reciprocity,” which you would discard. Indeed the first treaty of the kind was made with England by Mr. Madison, and is dated 3d of July, 1815.

Thus we perceive that Great Britain, the most commercial and enlightened nation in Europe, adopted it first; the Netherlands followed next. Later, came Denmark and Prussia. You think this system does not work well. “ Not long since the foreign carrying trade,

say you, was nearly all in our own hands. Now the reciprocity system, not including the colonies of foreign nations, gives to foreigners more than one third of all the carrying trade of the United States." Probably you have particular reference to those cheaply navigated vessels from Bremen, Hamburg and Sweden, which are so fast driving our merchant ships from the ocean. Would you know how this has come to pass? Turn to the debates of congress, and you will find an admirable speech of Mr. Webster's, to which I had the pleasure of listening in the house of representatives at Washington in 1824, when he was the champion of *free trade*, and the inflexible opponent of the protective system.

He was giving his reasons for opposing the high duties on iron, hemp, canvass, and the other articles entering into the construction of a ship, in answer to the arguments of Henry Clay and others; when he made an estimate of what the extra cost of a vessel would be, if congress should sanction the rates then proposed, amounting, if I remember rightly, upon a ship of the usual dimensions from \$4000 to 6000. He spoke of the madness and folly of such a tax, and predicted that it would ruin our ship-owners, and that foreigners would take away our carrying trade. Time has proved the truth of Mr. Webster's predictions, and so it has of all the principles he laid down in the famous Faneuil Hall resolutions sustained by him with so much power and eloquence in 1820.

Mr. Webster and yourself were both at that period the advocates of free trade and low duties. Of late years, at any rate since 1828, you have sustained the protective system with all your energies and power. The question is often asked how all the opinions upon political economy, which you and Mr. Webster must be presumed to have adopted after long and mature consideration, could all at once have become so changed; how you could have been induced to abandon the great and immutable truths so firmly established by such great men as Adam Smith, Ricardo and Brougham, and become the disciples of the doctrines of the late Judge Baldwin and Henry Clay.

Be assured you cannot retain the foreign carrying trade and a high protective tariff at the same time. To compete successfully with the cheap vessels of Bremen, Sweden, Hamburg, and other places in Europe, you must enact laws to favor the navigating interest, not to oppress it by excessive taxation. Hamburg and Bremen, you know, are *free Hanseatic cities*. Commerce requires freedom. It cannot live without it. Look at Rotterdam and Amsterdam, if you wish to see the effects of high protective duties. Hamburg is now what Tyre once was. Its population, at the time I was there in 1840, was estimated at 125,000. The import and export trade amounted to 70 millions of dollars per annum; and what think you was the duty paid on this sum? It amounted to only 150,000, dollars, about equal to what is paid at New York on the arrival of a Liverpool or Havre packet.

Do you wonder that we should hear the exclamation made every day how New York is falling off in the increase of its commerce and riches compared to what they might have been under a more enlightened and liberal policy? And yet after all there is something so deceptive in the name of "*protecting home industry*" that many

of the friends of the protective system may be found amongst the most active merchants in that city. I am not quite certain that the citizens of New York could not afford to have a fire every year nearly as destructive as that of July last, if by that means they could be relieved from the incubus of the protective system.

There are a few other statements made in your letter of the 16th Jan., which I am unwilling should pass without comment; but my remarks upon these must be deferred for my third and concluding communication.

I remain very truly,

Your friend and ob't serv't,

S. D. BRADFORD.

To the Hon. ABBOTT LAWRENCE, Boston.

MR. BRADFORD'S THIRD LETTER.

[FROM THE BOSTON POST.]

WEST ROXBURY, (*near Boston.*)

10th February, 1846.

DEAR SIR—In your letter to Mr. Rives, of the 16th of January, in speaking of Mr. Walker's report, you say—"it is no other than the adoption of ad valorem for specific duties, and a reduction of the whole to 20 per cent." In another part of your letter you call it "a total and entire change of a revenue system, which was established with the government, and has stood the test of experience through all the trials of political parties and administrations from General Washington to Mr. Polk."

Now I would appeal to you as a candid inquirer after truth whether the above be a fair representation of the case. How can Mr. Walker's plan be called "an entire change" when the ad valorem system is as old as the American government; and when even last year the revenue arising from ad valorem duties exceeded that realized from specific duties; although the average of ad valorem duties was 23 per cent., and the average of specific duties 41 per cent.? If you had said that the adoption of specific duties, now so much in favor with the protectionists because they cut off importations, was an innovation upon the system of revenue which has usually been adopted, it would have received the general assent of your readers.

The first tariff established by the administration of Washington is now before me. It is dated 20th July, 1790. The duties imposed by it are in general ad valorem; and the rate on woollens, cottons, silks, linens, and upon fabrics of a mixed character, is only 12½ per cent. ad valorem. These five descriptions of goods must then, as since that period, have constituted the principal value of our imports. There were a few commodities on which was imposed a

duty of 15 per cent. *ad valorem* ; and four articles were doomed to pay 20 per cent., viz: *coaches* or *chariots*, *girandoles*, *glass* and *looking glasses*, being no doubt considered luxuries, and therefore subjected to a higher duty agreeably to the principle recognized in Mr. Walker's last report. There are also specific duties on liquors, teas, coffee, and some other commodities, such as have usually been taxed in this way. It was under this tariff that our republic made such rapid advances, and our merchants acquired such large fortunes. Our ships were upon every sea.

You dwell upon the frauds which have been committed upon the revenue heretofore, and which you think will be again ; but you do not even allude to the *smuggling*, which exorbitant duties are sure to produce in every country which adopts them. You must have read of the effects they have produced in Spain, and some other countries in Europe. The estimate has been made that three fourths of the whole foreign trade of Spain is in the hands of smugglers. Mr. McCulloch, so frequently quoted by Sir Robert Peel as an authority, writing upon smuggling remarks—"It does not originate in any depravity inherent in man, but in the folly and ignorance of legislators. To *create* by means of high duties an overwhelming temptation to indulge in crime, and then to *punish* men for indulging in it, is a proceeding subversive of every principle of justice. The true way to put down smuggling is to render it unprofitable."

Is this sound doctrine or is it false ? Let it be adopted in the next tariff, and you will have very little cause in future to complain of "fraudulent foreigners," or double invoices. The protectionist and the smuggler have a close affinity. The one produces the other. Lord John Russell recently said in parliament that "protection was the bane of agriculture." It is equally true that smuggling is the bane of protection. The government may commission thousands of custom-house officers ; may line our coast with troops ; may establish coast guards from Massachusetts to Florida—but smuggling and defrauding the revenue will continue so long as the duties are prohibitive or exorbitantly high.

I do not think you are quite just towards our southern brethren in the account you give of the origin of what you call the "American system," which you say was "forced upon the north, and done for the purpose of creating a home market for the products of the soil of the south and west." At the assembling of the congress which passed the tariff of 1816, the public debt of the United States—principally incurred in the war against Great Britain, which ended in 1815—amounted to 158 millions of dollars. Nearly all the banks in the Union had suspended specie payments. The government was without credit, and almost without revenue. During the war a new interest had grown up, viz: the manufacturing ; and when the secretary of the treasury was about to prepare his report, or to bring in his budget, he was beset on the one hand by the manufacturers, and on the other by the merchants engaged in the foreign trade, who, notwithstanding all their losses by the embargo, non-intercourse, and war, continued even then to retain a good part of those riches, they had before acquired under that system of free trade and low duties, which I attempted to describe in my last communication. These were the parties, whose interests had to be

considered by congress, in enacting a new tariff. The high minded and patriotic statesmen of the south, J. C. Calhoun, William Lowndes, and others from that section of the country, came forward, as they had always done before, and responded to the necessities and wants of the nation. Their means were the least considerable. They had suffered incredible hardships and losses during the war, but they said the honor of the country must be preserved, and they passed the tariff of 1816; not so much, as you seem to suppose, to create a home market, as to sustain the credit of the country, and to liquidate the enormous debt which then oppressed it.

That novel experiment called "the minimums" was at this time introduced, because the people of this country being then principally clothed in cotton fabrics imported from India, it did not occur to the wisdom of congress that the revenue then wanted (about twenty-three millions) could be raised in any other way. Such, I believe, to be a true account of the introduction of what you call "the American system." You would date its birth from 1816; I, from 1828. You would attribute its paternity to J. C. Calhoun or William Lowndes; I would say it was unlawfully begotten by Henry Clay.

There is one portion of your letter in which I fully concur. I allude to that part, in which, speaking of protection, you remark that "New England, and particularly Massachusetts, could thrive without it. There can be no doubt of this, for it is confirmed by the experience of all those countries in Europe, which have avoided the protective system.

In what parts of the old world have manufactures most flourished since the peace of 1815? The answer is in Switzerland and Saxony, where there is no protective duty whatever. The manufactures of Switzerland can only be said to have been established since 1813; about the time we began to manufacture by power in the United States; and now they enter into competition with those of Great Britain in the markets of the East, and are sent to America and Brazil in large quantities.

As respects Saxony, her woollen, cotton, and linen manufactures have reached a degree of perfection and cheapness unequalled upon the continent of Europe. In the manufacture of cotton hosiery, she has deprived Great Britain of nearly all her foreign markets; and the beaux of Broadway, who, when you were engaged in the importing business, used to appear in one of *Thomas Shepherd's best*, are now clad in *superfine* from Saxony.

In Austria, on the contrary, where the protective system has always prevailed, the manufacturers are in a state of bare existence. In great Britain the same results have been witnessed in the silk trade. It was until 1824 a monopoly. French silks were prohibited, but the trade of Spitalfields presented only a succession of the most ruinous bankruptcies until 1824, when Mr. Huskinson reduced the duties on raw silk to three pence per pound, and permitted French manufactured silks to be admitted for home consumption at a duty of 30 per cent. The usual effects soon followed. The silk trade revived at once, and in nine years afterwards, (1833) had more than doubled. "To the prohibitive system," said Mr. Huskinson, "it was to be attributed that in silk only, in the whole range of manufactures, are we left behind our neighbors." From the above re-

marks you will perceive that in my opinion low duties are most favorable, even for the manufacturers themselves.

You have made a strong and animated appeal to the people of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and other states, to alarm their fears for the safety of the protection of their "iron, coal, hemp, cotton bagging, sugar, &c., &c." No one can mistake the object of this. You would have them to understand, I suppose, that if they fail in their duty of protecting the cottons and woollens of New England, they can no longer expect the aid of this section of the country, in protecting the manufactures or productions, in which they are interested. If, however, those states are ready to try "the experiment," you add that "you, as a citizen of Massachusetts, are ready to meet the result, which you doubt not will be found within eighteen months in the realization of all you have predicted." You then add—"We will work; if 12 hours labor in the 24 will not sustain us, we can, and will work 14."

I would be the last person to doubt the energy or perseverance of New England, but I may perhaps be permitted to suggest, that in my opinion the plan you have proposed for meeting the frightful revulsion you predict in "the failure of all the banks," "the drain of our coin," "the surfeit of foreign goods," &c., appears a most extraordinary one. The very nature of the crisis anticipated supposes an almost total cessation of business transactions. I have witnessed in Europe in 1819 and in 1837 to 1842, the most disastrous crises amongst the manufacturers, and the method, they adopted to save themselves from ruin, was to *shorten* the hours of labor, instead of *increasing* them. Sometimes they have been compelled to dismiss all their operatives, and shut up their mills.

And now, as respects the selfish and unaccommodating disposition of Europe in general. "You cannot discover," you say, "that there is a disposition on the part of a single European nation to relax their stringent system of duties on imports from this country." If this anti-commercial spirit really exists, how was our distinguished and talented ambassador at Berlin, Mr. Wheaton, able to negotiate the Zollverein treaty? and by whom was this first born of free trade and reciprocity strangled in the Senate of the United States? by the manufacturers, or by the advocates of a more liberal system of legislation? We all know that the *manufacturing* interest opposed this treaty, as it probably will all others, founded upon a reciprocal reduction of our own and foreign tariffs to a revenue standard.

Has Sir Robert Peel made no reduction in the English tariff upon various articles produced in this country? Has his recent resignation nothing to do with an attempt on his part to greatly reduce, or repeal altogether the duty on corn? *We shall soon see.* Would it not be something for our grain producing states to have their bread stuffs admitted duty free into a country containing 27 millions of people, estimated to consume 60 millions of quarters, or 480 millions of bushels of corn per annum? I use the word corn as it is understood in England, representing wheat, and other descriptions of grain.

But how can we expect foreign nations to make us any concessions, when we refuse to make any to them? You are aware that most of the governments of Europe are despotisms. The people have no

concern in making the tariffs or the laws. In England, where the people are daily acquiring more power, they are making unheard of exertions in favor of free trade. I need not remind you what have been the herculean labors of C. P. Villiers, Richard Cobden, J. B. Smith, John Bright, and a host of others, in the cause of free trade; nor what they have accomplished. All Europe is looking on with amazement and admiration. Their ranks have been recently increased by the addition of Lord John Russell, Lord Morpeth, and Mr. Labouchere; and it is supposed Sir Robert Peel himself is only waiting a convenient opportunity to follow suit. Such changes are remarkable, and foreshadow what may be expected in future.

You say, "I state the *fact* then, that exports will not increase, in consequence of a reduction, or even a total repeal of the present tariff." I only state my opinion that your prediction will prove false. Already I have shown what was the result in England, with regard to the silk trade. Not only was the home consumption, but the export also doubled in nine years after the reduction in the duty. This view of the subject is confirmed not only by the experience of our own country, but by the history of other nations.

You have remarked that "but a moderate portion of mankind have yet been clothed with the healthful and cheap article of cotton," and hence you have predicted that the consumption of that article in this country, will have reached 400 millions of pounds in 1856, a considerable part of which will have to be exported.

I on the other hand would remind you, that but "a moderate portion" of the people of Great Britain are fed with corn and butchers meat; and that in Ireland alone, we are assured by a strong protectionist in the British parliament "there are 5 millions of people, who rejoice on potatoes." All these people are in want of the bread stuffs and provisions, which can be supplied in such vast abundance by our brethren in the west; and how can you venture to predict that they cannot compete with foreign nations in their productions, as you say you have done with your cotton manufactures? Free trade has already obtained the total repeal of the duty on raw cotton. The next steamer may bring us the news of the total repeal of the duty on bread stuffs; and who can doubt that ere long there will be a total repeal of the provision laws?

It may be considered as almost certain, especially if we will reduce our tariff to a revenue standard, as recommended by Mr. Walker.

Let this be once done, so that we may import freely the productions of other nations, and instead of our having to *intercede* with the governments of those countries, *their own people* would do the work for us, as soon as they began to experience the difficulty of getting back their returns. This is the plan recommended by the first political economists of Great Britain, who are now perfectly satisfied that their country has become great and powerful, and acquired its great preeminence in manufactures, not in *consequence* of protection, but in *spite* of it.

Go from one end of Europe to the other, as I have done, and hear the opinion the wisest statesmen and most intelligent merchants express of American legislation, especially as respects our commercial policy, and our paper money currency. You will find it anything but flattering.

But you are satisfied with the protective system, and its "illustrations, you inform Mr. Rives, are so striking in every department of labor, that those, who fifteen years ago were the strongest opponents among us, have given up their theories, and acknowledge that the revelations are such as to satisfy the most skeptical."

You refer, I presume, especially to certain citizens of Boston, who having been free traders in 1831, are now protectionists; and what you state is unfortunately too true. We all remember Irving's amusing story of Rip-Van-Winkle, who having had a sleep of twenty years in the Kaatskill mountains, when he returned to his native village on the Hudson, was so changed that no one knew him, and that "troops of strange children ran at his heels hooting after him." This must have been a great alteration indeed. But if those free traders just mentioned, will only refer to the principles they advocated once, or go back to the famous Faneuil Hall resolutions, to which you yourself were a party, and compare them with the doctrines they advocate now, they will find the change quite as great as was that of Rip-Van-Winkle. Rip imputed his metamorphose to a certain intoxicating draught. "That flagon last night, said Rip, has addled my poor head sadly." Perhaps those *ci-devant* free traders, but now protectionists, have had their "poor heads addled" by extravagant dividends of 20 to 30 per cent. per annum.

But there are many exceptions to your remark, even in Boston. I have not changed, and the more I compare the condition of my own country with that of others, in which I have travelled or resided, the more I am convinced of the injurious effects of the protective system. There was a period when our opinions were the same, and we acted in concert. You and I began life nearly at the same time. We launched our barks upon the wide and uncertain ocean of commerce, it might be said, *on the same day*. For many years we sailed along almost always in sight of one another. The best and kindest feelings always prevailed between us. We felt there was sufficient room for all. Some time about 1828 you decided, to use a simile of your own, to "*take an observation and a new departure*." In process of time you have become, *par excellence*, the great manufacturer, whilst I may be said only to have contributed probably a larger sum to the public treasury, during the twenty-nine years I have been in business, than any individual of the same age in the United States. The foundation, then, of your fortune was laid in Leeds, Huddersfield, and Bradford in Wiltshire, and not in Lowell. If you are indebted for the larger part of it to the carding, roving, spinning, and weaving of cotton, you owe a respectable portion of it to the scribbling, scouring, slubbing, and teasing of wool. I have no fault to find on this account with you. I would on no account speak invidiously of one, for whom I entertain the most friendly feelings, and whose energy and enterprise I so much admire; nor would I be personal in my remarks. My objections are to the system itself, and to the policy of the government, which has disfigured this young republic of ours by clothing it with the cast-off garments of Europe, in the shape of protection and monopoly.

Do what you will, you cannot destroy *free trade*, nor retard its progress much longer. Its course is "upward and onward." It is being adopted by the nation which General Cass informs us "pos-

sesses already one-seventh of the whole earth, and whose government rules over one-eighth of all the inhabitants of the globe." It has recently overthrown the strongest, and in my opinion the best ministry, which has existed in England for a long time, because they hesitated to repeal the corn laws. It will overthrow the next probably, unless they will agree to remove the restrictions on provisions, and also on tea, coffee, and sugar. It is destined to change the fiscal regulations of the whole world. The opinion is becoming almost universal that when Great Britain shall adopt a scale of duties founded on a true revenue principle, the tariffs of all other nations will soon fall before it. It does not ask whether the industrious but suffering operative dwells in the mountains of Switzerland or upon the steppes of Russia. Its philanthropy is expansive. It embraces the whole world. It assists the deserving, and relieves the wants of the suffering, wherever they may be found. It is the herald of peace and civilization. Free trade may be compared to an Alpine plant. It is healthy and hardy, and survives the concussions of the severest tempests, for it depends on itself alone for support. Protection is a hot house plant, always kept alive at a great expense, often sickly, and requiring constant attention. What wise legislator would hesitate to which he should give the preference?

I remain very truly,

Your friend and ob't serv't,

S. D. BRADFORD.

To the HON. ABBOTT LAWRENCE, Boston.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

FANEUIL HALL MEETING,

IN THE YEAR 1820.

The famous Faneuil Hall Resolutions of 1820, having been alluded to in one of the letters forming a part of the present correspondence, and so many years having elapsed since their first publication, it has been deemed proper to have them annexed to the present publication. They are now therefore given with a part of "the record" of the different meetings of the merchants, which preceded them.

At a numerous meeting of the merchants and others, interested in the prosperity of the commerce and agriculture of the state of Massachusetts and of the United States, convened at Concert Hall, in the town of Boston, the 17th day of August, 1820, to take into consideration a communication from the chamber of commerce of Philadelphia,—

The Hon. WILLIAM GRAY in the chair, WILLIAM FOSTER, Jr., secretary.

Voted, That the Hon. WILLIAM GRAY, JOHN PARKER, Esq., and WILLIAM STURGIS, Esq., be a committee of nomination to designate and to fix the number of a committee.

Voted, On the report of the committee of nominations that the following persons be a committee:—

WILLIAM GRAY,	LOT WHEELWRIGHT,
JAMES PERKINS,	CALEB LORING,
JOHN DORR,	SAMUEL A. WELLES,
NATHANIEL GODDARD,	GEORGE BOND,
BENJAMIN RICH,	GEORGE HALLET,
ISRAEL THORNDIKE, JR.,	SAMUEL GARDNER,
WILLIAM SHIMMIN,	JOSIAH KNAPP,
THOMAS W. WARD,	ISAAC WINSLOW,
WILLIAM HARRIS,	WINSLOW LEWIS,
DANIEL WEBSTER,	THOMAS WIGGLESWORTH,
NATHAN APPLETON,	JOHN COTTON,
ABBOTT LAWRENCE,	JOHN PARKER,
JOSEPH SEWALL,	WILLIAM STURGIS.
JONATHAN PHILLIPS,	

Voted, That a committee of 23 be appointed to consider what measures are proper to be pursued in order to avert the calamity, which must eventually flow from the passage of the tariff bill, re-

ferred to the ensuing session of congress; and this committee be invested with plenary powers to carry into effect such measures as may by them be deemed most expedient on the occasion.

Voted, That this meeting be adjourned to the first Monday in October next, there to meet at Faneuil Hall at 11 o'clock, A. M., for the purpose of receiving the report of their committee, and adopting such further measures as the meeting may think expedient.

Provided, That this committee be authorized to call the meeting together at an earlier period, if they should think it necessary.

Signed,

WILLIAM FOSTER, Jr., Sec'y.

Mr. WEBSTER having been the first named upon a committee subsequently appointed "to prepare and publish an address," is understood to have been the author of the address, which may be found in the papers of the day, and also of the following resolutions:—

[FROM THE N. E. PALLADIUM AND COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER.]

Tuesday, October 3, 1820.

GENERAL MEETING.

Yesterday an adjourned meeting on the subject of the proposed tariff was held at Faneuil Hall, Hon. WILLIAM GRAY, chairman, and WILLIAM FOSTER, Jr., secretary.

A long and interesting report was read from the respectable committee appointed at a former meeting, which concluded with the following resolves:

1st.—*Resolved*, That we have regarded with pleasure the establishment and success of manufactures among us, and consider their growth, when natural and spontaneous, and not the effect of a system of bounties, and protection, as an evidence of general wealth and prosperity.

2d.—That relying on the ingenuity, enterprise and skill of our fellow citizens, we believe that all manufactures adapted to our characters and circumstances will be introduced, and extended, as soon and as fast as will promote the public interest, without any further protection than they now receive.

3d.—That no objection ought ever to be made to any amount of taxes equally apportioned, and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue necessary for the support of government, but that taxes imposed on the people for the sole benefit of any one class of men are equally inconsistent with the principles of our constitution, and with sound policy.

4th.—That the supposition that until the proposed tariff or some similar measure be adopted, we are, and shall be dependent on foreigners for the means of subsistence, and defence, is in our opinion, altogether fallacious, and fanciful, and derogatory to the character of the nation.

5th.—That high bounties on such domestic manufactures, as are principally benefitted by that tariff, favor great capitalists rather

than personal industry, or the owners of small capitals, and therefore, that we do not perceive its tendency to promote national industry.

6th.—That we are equally incapable of discovering its beneficial effects on agriculture, since the obvious consequence of its adoption would be, that the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells.

7th.—That the imposition of duties, which are enormous, and deemed by a large portion of the people to be unequal, and unjust, is dangerous, as it encourages the practice of smuggling.

8th.—That in our opinion, the proposed tariff and the principles on which it is avowedly founded, would if adopted, have a tendency, however different may be the notions of those who recommend them, to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people.

JAMES T. AUSTIN, Esq., and the Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER addressed their fellow citizens in favor of the Report and Resolves in speeches which were distinguished for closeness of argument, variety of illustrations and abundance of fact.

The Report was then accepted, and the Resolves recommended by the committee, unanimously passed.

A vote of thanks to the Hon. Mr. OTIS, of the Senate, and to those members from this State in the House of Representatives of the United States, who opposed the new tariff, was unanimously agreed to.

The Report, constituting the Preamble to the above Resolutions, is too long for insertion this day, forming 23 manuscript pages. It is to be printed in a pamphlet.

